

a moment let us think about what works in this country, what is good in your life, in your home, in your family, in your community, your city, what is good in the Federal Government, what programs work, what makes life better.

It is fascinating, once you start thinking in those terms, how you get people to start evaluating what is of value. You never think about the kind of road system we have in this country. But drive anywhere else in the world, and then drive in most parts of this country and take a look at the transportation system. Mail a letter in Tegucigalpa or Krakow, and then mail a letter in Chicago, and see which postal system gets it there. I mean, I could go through chapter and verse of the discussions.

One woman at a town meeting said to me, "Well, I'll tell you what works, my son's teacher. She called me and had a long discussion with me about the circumstances of my son in her class and really helped us a great deal. He has a wonderful teacher." I said, "Have you called the teacher and told her how you feel about that? You ought to do that." But it is a fascinating thing to discuss, not about what is wrong, but about what is right, not what needs fixing—and we spend almost all of our time on that—but what works in this country.

I hope in the context also of these political campaigns we can engage in a bit of hope and a description of opportunity in a way that emphasizes the good things, not just what is wrong.

I talked about Jack Kemp. Jack Kemp is an effervescent optimist. We need more effervescent optimists talking about the potential of this country and the future of this country. If I did not think that we were going to have a better future and that our best days are still ahead of us, I would hardly have the energy to be in public service. But I, every single day, take a look at my 9-year-old son who trudges off to school now in September, and I think, what a remarkable opportunity it is for us to be here, for him to go to that school, what a remarkable opportunity he is going to have, hopefully in a country that is going to continue to lead the way in this world.

This week, this President took action in Iraq. I know there is a real disconnection. People say, what on Earth do we have to do with Iraq? This country is a world leader, and it will be a world leader, and it must take responsible action in dealing with international outlaws like Saddam Hussein. And we will, it seems to me, under the stewardship of Democrats and Republicans who come together at the right time, believing through aggressive debate we can find better ways and we can find things that at the end of the day when the dust settles that will advance this country's standard of living, we will continue to maintain a country that most people see as the beacon of hope all around the globe.

Mr. President, I have covered a fair amount of ground. And I notice my col-

league from Iowa, Senator GRASSLEY, is here, and other colleagues I believe are coming to speak on other issues. I intend to continue to visit about a couple of these issues next Monday. But with that, I yield the floor. I thank the President for his attention.

#### MORNING BUSINESS

(During today's session of the Senate, the following morning business was transacted.)

#### EXPLANATION OF VOTE—SENATE RESOLUTION 288

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, last evening my vote was the only negative vote on the resolution relating to the President's military intervention earlier this week in Iraq. As there was little if any time last night to explain the reason for that vote, I intend to do it at this time.

It is the conventional wisdom, led perhaps by the President of the United States, that George Bush severely erred in not completing the war in the gulf against Iraq by the total defeat of its armed forces and the replacement of the Saddam Hussein government. Because I did not make such a criticism at the time, I do not join in that criticism now and regard it as essentially irrelevant to the activities of this week.

President Clinton, when he took that office, inherited the situation as it existed then, when that was no longer a real possibility. Since taking office, however, President Clinton's policies have caused the deterioration, if not the entire unraveling, of the coalition that was put together against Iraq at the time of the war in the gulf. Most particularly, his administration's indifference to the peculiar burdens imposed upon our ally, Turkey, and the particular problems and challenges that it faces, have caused us to be in a position in which we have been unable to use our bases in that country for any kind of response to Iraq. In fact, the coalition has unraveled to such an extent that we were not permitted to use the bases of any of our allies other than the United Kingdom in that response.

Earlier this summer we totally and completely ignored an incursion by Iranian forces, aimed to support its Kurdish partisans, into Iraq, across an international border. Earlier this summer we completely ignored Iraq's defiance of a U.N. search for prohibited weapons, both chemical and nuclear in nature.

Nevertheless, we did respond in a military fashion to a contest between Iraqi-backed Kurds and Iranian-backed Kurds earlier this week, and we responded, Mr. President, in a totally inappropriate fashion.

It seems to this Senator that at the time of the recent Iraqi incursion in support of its own faction in Kurdistan, we had essentially two choices: We

could have made the choice that we have no dog in that fight, that there was no favorite in a contest between a group backed by Iran and a group backed by Iraq. On the other hand, we could have responded militarily by showing that aggression does not pay. Under those circumstances, however, the only appropriate military response would be one which would exact a price substantially greater than the hoped-for goals of the aggression itself on the part of Iraq.

We did neither. We responded to this fight among Kurdish partisans in a way that could not possibly help the victims of that Iraqi aggression. In fact, we clearly stated that we were not attempting to reverse what Saddam Hussein was doing in the northern part of his own country.

The net result is this: The net result is that Iraq has regained control over much of Iraqi Kurdistan. It has slaughtered its rebels, many of whom were under our implicit protection and have been abandoned by us. It has shown the United States to be a paper tiger. And what cost has it paid, Mr. President? A handful of radar sites.

We have been abandoned by all of our allies in the Middle East, none of whom was willing to publicly support our military response. We have been repudiated by France with respect to our new no-flight zone. Our President has now terminated the military adventure and has proclaimed victory.

Mr. President, a few more victories like this and we will be announcing a no-flight zone over Riyadh.

The best analogy I can think of is this one: It is as if the Mayor of the District of Columbia was warned of an incipient drug war in some part of this city and expressed severe warnings against any violence in connection with that drug war. Faced with great violence and a number of murders, the Mayor then imposed \$100 fines on each one of the murderers and announced that the drug war was over and that the streets of Washington, DC, were safe. That, in effect, has been what our response was.

Mr. President, the United States has been defeated and humiliated. We have added to the instability of the Middle East and have whetted Saddam Hussein's appetite for further adventures.

No consultation, no advance notification was given to any Member of Congress in connection with this adventure. Under the circumstances, Mr. President, I do not believe that any resolution of support, even one so cautious, so reluctant, so absent in praise as the one passing last night was warranted.

I believe that within a short period of time, a majority of my colleagues will wish that they had voted the way in which I voted last night. It was an inappropriate resolution, an inappropriate response to an inappropriate action on the part of the President of the United States.